

FIFA, Global Governance and Cosmopolitanism

Muhammad Nizar Hidayat

Peneliti pada Nusantara Strategic House, Samarinda

Abstract:

Cosmopolitanism as a subject of study has been increasingly integrated in International Relations. It concerns with the notion of 'oneness' of human kind as citizens of the world. The modern society who lives in globalization era will now be able to reflect on each other and see the similarities they shared together. One of the similarities of modern society is their addiction to sports, in this case, its football. Football binds people from each different cultures, geographical spheres, nationalities, religions, and other primordial binding that was less able to integrate people into a sense of 'oneness'. FIFA in the other hand emerge as the consequences of this shared idea of football. The governing body has evolved into the supreme entity which has around 209 members, more than UN which 'only' has 198 in its list. This paper aims to elaborate FIFA as football's global governance, it's evolution, and it's role in spreading cosmopolitan values in more cultural ways, and less politics.

Keywords: *Cosmopolitanism, Globalization, Global Governance, FIFA*

Abstrak:

Kosmopolitanisme sebagai subjek studi telah terintegrasi secara luas dalam Hubungan Internasional. Studi tersebut menekankan pada "kesatuan" umat manusia sebagai penduduk dunia. Masyarakat modern yang hidup di era globalisasi sekarang lebih mampu untuk merenungkan kesamaan yang mereka miliki dengan orang lain. Salah satu kesamaan tersebut adalah kegemaran terhadap olahraga khususnya sepakbola. Sepakbola menyatukan orang dari berbagai kebudayaan, letak geografi, kewarganegaraan, agama dan ikatan primordial lainnya yang sebelumnya kurang mampu untuk menyatukan manusia kedalam satu golongan besar. FIFA dilain pihak muncul sebagai dampak dari kegemaran masyarakat terhadap sepakbola dan otoritas tertinggi sepakbola tersebut telah berevolusi menjadi entitas yang memiliki 209 anggota melebihi PBB yang hanya memiliki 198 anggota. Tulisan ini bermaksud untuk menggambarkan FIFA sebagai global governance dalam sepakbola, evolusinya, dan perannya dalam menyebarkan nilai-nilai kosmopolitanisme dengan lebih kepada aspek kebudayaan dibanding politik.

Kata Kunci : *Kosmopolitanisme, Globalisasi, Pemerintahan Global, FIFA*

No one could deny that football has emerged as the most popular sport on earth. This claim can be proven by merely observe our daily life. In contemporary world headlines of major newspapers or online news oftently potray popular issues in football from footballers super salary, their high class life style, beautiful partners to controvercies like dopping scandals and

matchfixing. Footballers are also become trendsetters and idolized by millions of people around the world. Aware of this phenomena Sandvoss said that football beyond that also serves as the emblem, trademark of modern society that has no precedent in history of humankind (Sandvoss : 2003). Of course before football have its global pervasive popularity as today, people had their own specific bond in forming the sense of similarity or simply to create some form of community. Those bonds could be found in cultural, religious, economics, or political terms but as we will see below they were all relatively “weaker” bonds compare to what footballdom has to offer especially in their functional role as a common ground for creating a global governance.

People from all around the world now have something that binds them together, much tighter than before. We can see it clearly, even in our closest surroundings. When we found a Liverpool fan cried because his team lost the title- a team and city he probably never been to- we would see that as normal things. Even when the fan themself belongs to different nation, religion, ethnic, and culture, than the city of Liverpool and United Kindom in general. We found a connection between the fan and the club, regardless of the distances. This connection also serves as a platform in forming mutual identity as appears in Liverpool fans identified themselves as such rather than pointing to their culture, ethnicity, nationality, or religion. What we tend to ignore is the fact that the world is not always like this. There were times, when the world had totally different face than what we live in today. It was the time before and after Westphalia Treaty was signed in 1648.

While the earliest society of Westphalia had not yet realized their similarity, in fact there was time when the world was divided in ways that we could not conceive today. Prior to Westphalia, religions, race, geography, ethnics, and other primordial bonds separated people. They served as platforms for identity, albeit non effective because it was not clear wheter a person belong to or to be identified as who. This unclear dividing line could be seen in pre-Westphalian European political maps where mostly drawn with colours gradations rather than clear-cut line as today’s map is. The colours represent territorial influence/power of each political entities which were mainly in the form of rivaling dynasties. To make things more obscure, within the map itself there are overlapping colours since the influence of one dynasty could be spread over to other political units. Feudal system triumphed at that time and based on its hierarcial order divided people on their status. But still, even when feudalism provided definitions in regards of class as who could be categorized as knights, peasants, lords, etc, it did not help much when it comes to defining a territorial of political units. At the apex of feudal system there was a Pope, a religious leader with his followers spread all over European Continent. His influence thus was pervasive in each of feudal’s hierarchial classes. Other religious figures that had signifikan influence were

bishops but unlike the Pope, their influence was limited to specific area they were settled.

Below the Pope, there were rivaling Kings in which their influence and power covered most of the continent. These kings fought over power, wealth and influence to broaden their territory, and some kingdom were even large enough to form a dynasty. Landlords come next as they were granted some area within a king's territory and they had to obey the kings in returns for the protection of king's military power. This hierarcial order could be extended to Knights, Peasant and Slaves, but to make things shorter, there were confusion about people identity as it might be overlapped based on conflicting influences of those political actors. This identity crisis then lead to a more confusing situation when the times of war, on which political units people had to pledge their allegiance if these political actors fought each other? Too many complicated webs of influence, power, over the continent, made Europeans invented a hard, definitive concept of a political units called nation-state. It was the moment Westphalian concept of nation-state created and from then spread around the world as modern form of a political unit.

Westphalian nation-states¹ then divided people according to their 'nation' and gave states full authority to govern its people in its given boundaries. People then separated by boundaries, artificial boundaries resulted from Westphalian Treaty. It was "European Way" to solved their problem regarding its overlapping authorities between Pope, Bishops, Kings, Landlords and many other. That blurred authorities confused people, in terms of which one did they should give their loyalty to. With defined boundaries among the earliest states of Westphalia, this problem, relatively "tamed", and after that, people were no longer left in perplexity, so was their government. Along with this historical momentum, the term "sovereignty" was coined (Mingst : 1999). And there was an international consensus stating that there are no sovereignty above nation-state.

When Europeans started to colonialized the rest of the world, they carried this very idea of separation. The model of Westphalian nation-state proliferated among the colonies, and was concieved as the best model to manage the people. It resulted to the more separated world, consisting of multiple sovereign states (Diener and Hagen : 2010). Boundaries was drew arbitrarily on the map, dividing not only between different ethnics, nations, culture and tribes, but among the very same entities. It was political in the beginning and for some states their boundaries were determined not by themselves but their previous colonizers. Postwar period marked a phase in history where numbers of nation-states arised significantly resulting in more divided world based on their nationality. It was also the times when nationalism spread and

¹ In this paper nation-states and countries will to be used interchangeably.

internalized into newly liberated states mostly in third world countries where nationalism played significant role in state formation and shared identity among citizens. Internalization of nationalism among newly liberated states hardening the dividing line that was already established when colonial power ruled their land. International society –or some would say European version of international society- expanded, so did their primary institution called sovereignty.

How then in a world so divided, people around the world finally find their similarities, in this case their enthusiasm on football regardless of their geographical, cultural, and political standing? And even more, resulting into a global governance (something that would conflicted the Westphalian world) of football in the form of FIFA? This paper will try to illuminate the problems questioned in the following sections. First we will see the how the main paradigms in International Relations view the world and to what extent the possibilities of a global governance could emerge in those paradigms. The next section will describe the social and political context in which football could sneak in and then become the bound that binds people in one roof, after that the evolution of the sport itself from the birth until it has a global goorning body in FIFA will be discussed. As FIFA grows, Cosmopolitanism is seen as more effective to be accepted by the world when their values are promoted by FIFA as the governing body of popular sporting culture, and then the last is conclusion of the disscussion.

Quest for Global Governance in the Main Theoretical Paradigms

In the history of mankind, people had been divided based on their religious beliefs, cultural affiliation, economical capacity and of course political bound. These boundaries were seen as hindering factors for people to find similarities among themselves an identity we could shared together. As history shows, divided entities was perceived as ingredient for conflict and war, at least this is what realist and neo-realist think of the world. Then, in such divided world, anarchy become the norm of international relations along with its integral dimentions of self-help, survival goal, and power (military and economically) orientation.

Nothing sovereign over sovereignty of states means that the world operates in anarchy, a condition where no entities are above states and all states are equal. This premise is the basis for two major paradigms or school of thought in International Relations, (Neo)Realism and Neoliberalism. Realism, as the main school of thought in International Relations describe the world as consisted of colliding billyard balls, where each nation-states seek to maximize their advantage and limiting others in order to survive. Within Realism thought, there are little space- if not to say not at all- for nation-states to cooperate and be willingly to conduct something for the benefits of all

(Donnelly in Burchill et.al : 2005). In an anarchy world, no states would help others in the expense of their own survival or interest as Realists called it. Each states responsible of their well-being and had nothing to do with the conditions of other states. It might sound sorrow but that is the best act of state in protecting it's citizens life in a world when states struggles for power (Morgenthau : 1963). This view thrupmped after World War II as the “universal truth” when one observe the global politics, yet it even get stronger when Waltz’s Neorealism provided International Realtions student with powerful explanations emphasizing on anarchy as international structure (Watlz : 1979).

The world of Realist and Neorealist would predict the world in perpetual conflicts and war among nation-state. There is no room for meaningful cooperation between two states let alone at multilateral and global stage. Thus, the world of Realist and Neorealist is a world of individual nation-states with its prime goal to survive at all cost. People divided based on their citizenships and have no incentives to cooperate with the citizens of the other nation-state. Needless to say, that with such view, Realism rejects the possibility of the world to be integrated and its people to have shared ideas about all the similiarities that binds them altogether. Cosmopolitant thinkers who wish to see a world where people from around the world unite or at least aware of their similarity as human being would be regarded as delutional or to say it in softer tone, as an utopist.

This “utopian” worldview is more accustomed to the Liberal version of the world. As liberal would say, they star their argument with the different premise of those of realist. People, liberal say, are naturally good and thus open to any possibilities of cooperation. Conflicts and wars are seen as the consequences of misunderstanding and mismanagement of an illiberate world. To some degree, they share realist notion of anarchy but still they believe that conflict and war are not natural consequences of anarchy itself.

Liberal tradition in International Relations suffers from factual defect of their theory after World War II outbreak. Liberal version of the world was attacked (mainly by realist) as utopian and to the extent of impossible version of the world. But their aspiration of a peaceful world remains alive and gain further strength within a furnished version of Neoliberalism. Neoliberalism as a response to Neorealism shrugged off its rival’s claim that international structure has only one way to go: conflict and war. They tried to build their argument based on Neorealist notion of “gain” –thus created a debate about absolute and relative gain- and lead to a conclusion that cooperation could emerge even in a world full of selfish political entities (see Keohane : 1984, Baldwin.ed : 1993).

Neoliberalism then gives a new hope for those who long for a world where human would live as one entity without artificial boundaries. It gives

possibilities of a global (or universal) institution as the ultimate means for people to cooperate in international level. But still, Neoliberals cannot escape but to build their argument of the possibilities of such global governance within economy and political considerations which are proven to be rather weak basis for a truly global-bond institution as nation-state still have their conflicting interests which cannot be compromised.

Even so, Cosmopolitanism aspiration find their hope re-awaken as Constructivism enter the stage of theoretical debate. Constructivist emerged as theoretical lens in International Relations around 80s and tried to propose a different postulate in studying world politics. They found Neorealism and Neoliberal perpetual debate of relative and absolute gain to be misled by their main postulate of material point of view and their concept of “rationality”. Their critique is more on ontological ground, as Neorealism and Neoliberalism seen International Relations and their properties (such as national interest, power etc.) as given and are “outside there” while Constructivism as its name suggest seen the world as man-made i.e constructed (Phillips : 2007).

This radical view also apply to the concept of anarchy as constructivist seen it as “what states make of it” (Wendt : 1992). When anarchy –the prerequisite of conflicting world- is seen as a product of human instead of natural constant, then the other world different from what it is today is possible. The transformation of the world consisted of dividing entities to the world united at least in their consensus in football using Constructivism norm-life cycle and also the context enabling the world to aggregate in forming FIFA as football global governance will be elaborated in the next sections.

Globalization and the Context of Transformation

Fortunately, the world saw another defining moment that reshaped its face, named the revolution of information technology (IT). The progress of IT enabling the world to be connected, even to the remote parts of it. And in recent years, more sophisticated IT make communicating a lot easier. Through TV, cellphones, and internet, we can know what is happening in the other parts of the world. It has a huge impact on human history, never before we live in such connected world. Globalization is a term used to describe this phenomena, but the term itself is not unproblematic. Masamichi Sasaki cited Keith Woodward’s comment on globalization, saying that globalization is many thing and can be interpreted from many different perspectives from economic, social, psychological, political, even philosophical (Sasaki : 2004). To make things easier, Roland Robertson simply defined globalization as a ‘compression of the world’ due to increased global (international/interregional) interdependence (Robertson : 1992). It referred to the more fluent movement of people, idea, goods and services across nation-states boundaries. Westphalian borders become more permeable and

obscured. Now we live in an era of borderless world, where nation-states has begun to crumble, said Kenichi Ohmae (Ohmae : 1996). For cosmopolits though, the rapid progress of IT enabling us to interact more closely, meaning the possibility for the world to meet at the same value and idea through intense interaction and fullfil the normative goal for all cosmopolits, share value and ideas about the unity or ‘oneness’ of all humankind.

Scholars have identified many examples of this emerging perspective. Many high level cooperations at the global stage are believed as the implementation of cosmopolitan view among states, or NGO around the world. While recent research mainly focused on cooperation among states in economic, enviroentment, human rights, and so on, this paper move below from those high issues and choose to focus on cultural aspect. This paper argued that while the revolution of IT has given the world a possibility to interact more frequent, cosmopolitan idea have a bigger chance to be spreaded more vast on cultural level, than some highly disputed notions previously stated. People from all around the world are much more easier to agree and conceive ideas about music, motion pictures, and sports, in this paper, its football. Here we aim to elaborate the governing body of football in which people from around the world had agree to form, FIFA, its evolution since its inception and its role in promoting cosmopolitan norms to the world.

Forming Global Governance of Football

Football as we know today has a long history. Many has said regarding the origin of football. Some said it was already played from the time of Roman Empire, some said it was originated from Chinese Empire. However, for the sake of this paper, we will only start from the beginning of the modern football. Modern football began its presence in Sheffield, Britain, around 1850s-1860s, and was divided into two varieties: rugby and soccer (Harvey : 2005), and football in this paper referred to the latter form. Modern football means that the game is regulated and standardized, differed from the earliest form of unregulated football called “folk football” (Sandvoss :2003). Modernization of football were the conscequenses of rational industrialism and industrial modernity that took place in seventeenth century (Sandvoss : 2003). The need to modernized football was derived from increasing popularity of the game among society in England. In 1863, Football Association was form as a governing body of British football. Since then British FA became the model of modernization of the game for other countries. From there, football began to spreaded to other continents, started from England and Wales to Europe, North America, South America, and Africa. Its spreading was a logical conscequenses of British imperialism, where they had managed to spread not only their territorial colonies but also ideas and shared enthusiasm on football. Since 1863, there were many countries influenced either directly or indirectly by British and formed football clubs in their respective countries

such as Argentina, Australia, Astro-Hungarian Empire, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central and Eastern Africa, Chile, China, Columbia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Holland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Ottoman Empire, Paraguay, Portugal, Russia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay and United States (Harvey : 2005).

Growing enthusiasm on football had prompted seven countries to form an international association based on the shared ideas about the game. In 1904, football associations from Spain, Netherland, France, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, and Switzerland founded Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). In the same year, the first FIFA Statutes were laid down and became the first universal regulation on international football. It was consisted of the following points: 1) the reciprocal and exclusive recognition of the national associations represented and attending, 2) clubs and players were forbidden to play simultaneously for different national associations, 3) recognition by the other associations of a player's suspension announced by an association and, 4) the playing of matches according to the Laws of the Game of the Football Association Ltd (<http://www.fifa.com/classicfootball/history/fifa/foundation.html>).

Soon after its inception, FIFA members began to increased. In 1905 British FA joined and followed by Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Hungary, outside of European continent South Africa joined in 1910, Chile in 1912, and United States in 1913. In those early years, FIFA focused on strengthening the Laws of The Game, establishing FIFA as the sole regulator of international football. It was exhibited when FIFA forbade its members to play against English Ramblers, an English football club who wanted to play the games without the authorisation of the British FA (<http://www.fifa.com/classicfootball/history/fifa/fifa-takes-shape.html>). FIFA's monopoly on the game was also shown in the acceptance of FIFA regulation in Olympic Tournament, so that football in Olympics would be played according to the Law of The Game set by FIFA. Increasing members meant that FIFA had to face different cultures apart from its original European members. For example, footballers from Asia and Africa preferred to play barefoot due to economic and practical reasons, like Indian footballer at 1948 London Olympics (Dietschy : 2013). But FIFA, insisted that Law of The Game had to be obeyed, and Indian national team were not allowed to participate in 1950 Brazil World Cup.

In 1930, FIFA held its first World Cup in Uruguay, and since then, the event proved to be the most successful product of the organization. FIFA World Cup held every four years and it has been held 19 times since 1930 until 2010 and was only ceased during World War II. Until now, it has been regarded as the most prestigious trophy in football world. From this event though, football

started to be globalized. Began in Switzerland 1954 World Cup, it was the first World Cup to be televised. In 1970 World Cup was broadcasted in colours, while 1978 World Cup began to be televised in 100 countries. The numbers of audiences increased in 1994 World Cup, reaching more than 30 billions of viewers, and 2002 World Cup was broadcasted in 213 countries (Chisari : 2006).

Following the success of World Cup and growing enthusiasm of football on global scale and its relation with broadcasting industry, FIFA was faced with another task, this time it's about financial. The revenues generated from World Cup, TV contracts, and other sponsorships forced FIFA to change itself, while it was a good news for FIFA, but in the other hand, it was also a challenge for the organization to reform. Indeed, since 1961 FIFA has conducted major governance reform shifting from the governing body worked with the means of a "*gentlemen's club*" to a more professionalized corporate management. For examples, the General Secretariat was enlarged, marketing was centralized, and power within the organization was shifted from Congress to the Executive Committee (Pieth : 2011). The principles of good governance, along with its transparency, accountability, and so on are considered important to be implemented on FIFA because it was registered as a non-profit organization. With all the revenues it has been enjoyed, FIFA could only be allowed to invest its profits into the objectives of the organization which are: 1) protecting and developing the game, 2) promoting football globally, 3) defending and developing the Laws of the Game, and 4) organizing international championships (Pieth : 2011). The recent developments show that demands for more open, democratic, and transparent FIFA are still being promoted by many parties. It shows that the evolution of FIFA as football global governance is still taking place.

From the elaboration of the evolution of FIFA as football supreme organization as stated before, we could see that FIFA fits the criteria of global governance set by International Relations scholars. Global governance itself is the processes and institutions, both formal and informal, that guide and restrain the collective activities of a group (Keohane : 2002). Football Associations from seven states felt they had a same enthusiasm, a shared idea on football, and agreed to form a supranational association to facilitate their demand. They realized that if they want to expand the game further from their own country and to compete with another team from other enthusiastic countries, they would need a regulator. FIFA set the universal rules on football and it serves as the guidelines for its members. (Un)Surprisingly, despite the conflicts and controversies, members of FIFA are showing high degree of compliance. Any governments who intervene their Football Association would be banned from the membership and not allowed to compete in the World Cup. And the society within a country would force their government to

comply, like one we could see from Indonesian case who pushed for PSSI (Indonesian FA) to solved the dual league problems that violates FIFA's law.

Why they those states felt the same enthusiasm on football? And why do states comply with FIFA? Here, constructivism comes in handy. Constructivism according to Alexander Wendt is a structural theory of international system that makes the following core claims: 1) states are the principal units of analysis for international political theory, 2) the key structures in the state system are intersubjective, rather than material, and 3) states identities and interests are in important part constructed by these social structures, rather than given exogenously to the system by human nature or domestic politics (Griffiths : 1999). Moreover, Wendt added his definition of constructivism and said that there are two basic tenets of constructivism: 1) that the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces, and 2) that the identities and interest of purposive actors are constructed by these shared ideas rather than given by nature (Wendt : 1999).

Finnemore and Sikkink introduced the norm life cycle to explain the evolution of shared norms and values in social world including IR. It composed of three linked stages: emergence, cascade, and internalization (Hoffmann in Sterling-Folker : 2006). States through its Football Associations felt the same enthusiasm on football based on intersubjectivity resulted from their long interaction. When modern football codified in Britain around nineteenth century, they introduced the game to the rest of the world as their territorial colonies constitute nearly half of the world. It was the stages of norm emergence, British was a norm entrepreneur, carried their enthusiasm on football around the world. When a critical mass- other countries, colonies, etc-accepted this new idea, then it was a norm cascade, a stage when the idea of football contented with local leisure activity contrast to football, such as traditional games. And when the others fully accepted this new idea and taken it as given in their everyday life, then it was a stage of norm internalization. British was a norm entrepreneur of modern football, but it was replaced (and assisted) by FIFA, and it was through FIFA that the idea of football's universality was emerged, and eventually internalized around the world.

Cosmopolitanism Through FIFA

The term cosmopolitanism sometimes confused with another term discussed before, globalization. While globalization is understood as a process that erodes national boundaries, integrating national economies, cultures, technologies and governance, producing complex relations of mutual interdependence (Norris in Nye and Donahue : 2000), cosmopolitanism as Pnina Werbner cited from Pheng Cheah, describes a "citizen of the world", member in a "universal circle of belonging that involves the transcendence of the the particular and blindly giben ties of kinship and country" (Werbner :

2008). Cosmopolitanism requires not only tolerance, respect and enjoyment of cultural difference but also a concomitant sense of global belonging, a kind of growing global consciousness that can be integrated into everyday life practices (Salazar : 2010). Andrei Markovits and Lars Rensmann wrote that sports in cosmopolitan context, served both as “bridging capital”, a term coined by Robert Putnam which is an integrative force among different groups and their cultural boundaries, and “bonding capital”, an hardening of boundaries among different constituencies and their cultures (Markovits and Rensmann : 2010).

There are many aspects of cosmopolitanism that we can see in football nowadays, in fact, it is not a hard task for us to find the evidence. As we stated earlier, when we saw a Liverpool fans cried because of the team lost the title, but we found him not in Liverpool, but in Jogjakarta, for example, we were seeing a cosmopolitanism values conceived by the fan. Sense of belonging, transcending particularities - kinship, culture, city, nation-state- of a universal values are the core of cosmopolitanism. Here the fan has a sense of belonging to a club which its city he might never been before. As a citizen of the world, he can choose to support any team in the world regardless of its cultural or geographical distances. While choosing to support a particular team might resulted to be engaged in rivalry with another, it is worth noted that they are all bond by the similarity of supporting football in general. Football is a cosmopolitan idea when people from 213 countries have a shared interest on the game, and when they accepted the Laws of The Game set by FIFA. No matter who or where we are live, the way we play football, would be the same as others. When 213 countries have a shared interest on football and watch the World Cup, it is worth noted that many of those countries never compete in World Cup final stage. It means that many people support other countries in World Cup and have a sense of belonging to that particular countries.

Particularism as the opposite of cosmopolitanism takes many forms. In football, it usually related to racism, sexism, homophobia, and extreme form of masculinity. There are facts that such forms of particularism still occurred even in more developed football cultures such as English Premier League, Italian Serie A and Spanish La Liga. Discrimination of coloured players make the most headlines of those leagues, like the racist chants towards Mario Balotelli in Italy and the throwing of banana towards Dani Alves in Spain.

FIFA as the global governance on football has zero tolerance on such discriminations that could hamper the idea of football as “people’s game” and belong to every humankind. Since its inception, FIFA carried cosmopolitan idea on its Statutes. In Article 3 of the FIFA Statutes it states that:

“Discrimination of any kind against a Country, private person or group of people on account of race, skin colour, ethnic, national or social origin, gender, language, religion, political opinion or any other opinion, wealth, birth or any other status, sexual orientation or any other reason is strictly prohibited and punishable by suspension or expulsion.”
(<http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/socialresponsibility/antiracism/>)

Every match and competition organized by FIFA would be observed by FIFA and ensured that the game is played according to FIFA Disciplinary Code, which describes the sanctions when the Code is violated. This Code is not only applied to members, clubs, officials, players, match officials, but also spectators. FIFA founded the FIFA Anti-Discrimination Days every year at one of FIFA's competitions. In that day, there are media briefing, media release and a pre-match protocol, a moment when the team captains read a declaration againsts discrimination, and ended as the teams and the referees come together of the pitch and demonstrate football's stance againsts discrimination. In 2013, FIFA passed a stricter rules on discrimination, particularly racism (Ames and Stainburn : 2013). They are consist of several rules like a warning, fine or playing a match behind a closed doors for a minor offense. This has been the case for several Italian Serie A clubs in 2013/2014 season when their fans were accused of making racist chants againsts coloured playes and particular region such as Napoli. The other rules set a punishment of points loss, expulsion from a tournament or relegation of the club if the offenses are repeated and serious. Players or official will be banned for five matches in they engage in racist abuse in any game. And potential act of racism or discrimination will be observed by a new official in the stadium to assist the referee and his assistants so any violation of the rules will be spotted right away.

We can see the process of promoting cosmopolitan values by FIFA with the same lenses we observe the spread of football enthusiasm. This time, FIFA moved further from an organization that merely tasked to govern the world of football to become a norm entrepreneur on cosmopolitan values. While the result –i.e internalization – of cosmopolitan values that FIFA has promoted, in this case non-discrimination acts, are highly debatable, one we can agree upon is the step FIFA has taken in this case has shown us that FIFA and football can't be regarded as merely non important organization, leisure and sport. They can help the world to reshape its face.

Conclusion

As we accept the notion of globalization and the proliferation of cosmopolitan norms around the world, we can see it clearly in a more cultural ways, in this case, its football. Football itself represents both globalization and cosmopolitanism. When the British carried this game throughout its colonies and the rest of the world, football began its first step to be globalized, and the second huge step was taken when the World Cup was televised and broadcasted in many countries. FIFA emerged as the consequences of this football globalization. Founded by seven countries who shared a common interest on football in 1904, FIFA evolved as the global governance of football, setting the universal rules of the game that have to be obeyed by all members. FIFA's cosmopolitan idea could be traced back to its inception when the FIFA Statutes clearly rejected any form of discrimination and other particularism views. With its stricter rules against racism, FIFA seeks to promote cosmopolitan idea that football belongs to everyone, and we as humankind are also one in football world.

References

- Ames, Paul and Samantha Stainburn, *FIFA Introduces Stricter Anti-Racism Rules*, Global Post, 31 May 2013, in <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatches/globalpost-blogs/world-at-play/fifa-introduces-stricter-anti-racism-rules>, retrieved on 20 May 2014.
- Baldwin, David A., ed. (1993). *Neorealism and Neoliberalism*. New York : Columbia University Press
- Burchill, Scott et.al, eds. (2005). *Theories of International Relations*. New York : Palgrave Macmillan
- Chisari, Fabio. (2006). "When Football Went Global: Televising the 1966 World Cup", *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, Vol.31, No.1 (115)
- Diener, Alexander C. and Joshua Hagen, eds. (2010). *Borderlines and Borderlands Political Oddities at the Edge of Nation-State*. Plymouth : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
- Dietschy, Paul. (2013). "Making Football Global? FIFA, Europe, and The Non-European Football World, 1912-74", *Journal of Global History*, Vol.8, Issue.2
- FIFA *Againts Discrimination*, in <http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/socialresponsibility/antiracism/>, retrieved in 20 May 2014.
- Griffiths, Martin. (1999). *Fifty Key Thinkers in International Relations*. London : Routledge,
- Harvey, Adrian. (2005). *Football: The First Hundered Years The Untold Story*. New York : Routledge
- History of FIFA-FIFA Takes Shaped, in <http://www.fifa.com/classicfootball/history/fifa/fifa-takes-shape.html>, retrieved on 20 May 2014.
- History of FIFA-Foundation, in <http://www.fifa.com/classicfootball/history/fifa/foundation.html>, retrieved on 20 May 2014.
- Keohane, Robert O. (1984). *After Hegemony*, London : Routledge
- Keohane, Robert O. (2002). *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*, London : Routledge
- Markovit, Andrei S. and Lars Rensmann. (2010). *Gaming The World How Sports Are Reshaping Global Politics and Culture*, New Jersey : Princeton University Press
- Mingst, Karen. (1999). *Essentials of International Relations*. New York : W. W. Norton & Company
- Morgenthau, Hans J., (1963), *Politics Among Nations*, New York : Alfred A Knopf.

- Nye Jr, Joseph S. and John D. Donahue, eds. (2000). *Governance in A Globalizing World*, Washington D.C : Brooking Institution Press
- Ohmae, Kenichi. (1996). *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of the Regional Economies*, London : HarperCollins
- Phillips, Andrew Bradley. "Constructivism". (2007). in Martin Griffiths (ed), *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century An Introduction*, New York : Routledge.
- Pieth, Mark. (2011). *Governing FIFA*, Concept Paper and Report, Universität Basel
- Robertson, Roland. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London : Sage
- Salazar, Noel B. (2010). "Tourism and Cosmopolitanism: A View From Below", *Int. J. Tourism Anthropology*, Vol.1, No. 1
- Sandvoss, Cornel. (2003). *A Game of Two Halves Football, Television, and Globalization*. London : Roudledge
- Sasaki, Masamichi. (2004). "Globalization and National Identity in Japan", *International Journal of Japanese Sociology*, No.13
- Sterling-Folker, Jennifer. (2006). *Making Sense Of International Relations Theory*. London : Lynne Rienner
- Waltz, Kenneth. (1979), *Theory of International Politics*, Addison-Wesley Ontario : Publishing Company
- Wendt, Alexander. (1992). "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Contruction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.2, pp. 391-425
- Wendt, Alexander. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press
- Werbner, Pnina. (2008). *Anthropology and New Cosmopolitanism*. New York : Berg